DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 163 VT 011 121

TITLE	Whatever Happened to What's His Name. A Follow-Up Survey of Inactive Applicants in the Raleigh, N.C. Area.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina Employment Security Commission, Raleigh. Job Market Research Center.
PUB DATE	Mar 69
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Employment; *Employment Services; *Followup Studies; Job Applicants; *Job Placement; *State Surveys; Tables (Data); Unemployment; Wages
IDENTIFIERS	North Carolina

ABSTRACT

The North Carolina Employment Security Commission (ESC) conducted a followup study of the 986 State applicants deactivated during August 1968 and 6 months later to ascertain the effectiveness of the program. This report is concerned primarily with the 6-month followup. The 586 applicants who responded to the first questionnaire were mailed the followup survey. A total of 494 persons after 1 month and 464 after 6 months were still in the labor force. About two-thirds of the respondents were employed at the time of both studies. The unemployment rate was 21.7 in August and 14.2 percent 6 months later, reflecting the fact that 30 persons in the group dropped out of the labor force. For both the 1- and 6-month followup studies, the increase in the mean weekly earnings for those applicants who received services was greater than the gain in the mean weekly earnings of those applicants who did not receive services. A report on the 1-month followup study is available as MP 000 766. (BC)

ED056163

63

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO WHAT'S HIS NAME

A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF INACTIVE APPLICANTS IN THE RALEIGH, N. C. AREA MARCH, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Employment Security Commission of North Carolina
Bureau of Employment Security Research
Job Market Research Center
Raleigh, N. C.

VT011121

SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF INACTIVE APPLICANTS
IN THE RALEIGH, N. C. AREA
MARCH, 1969

Explanation of the Study

This report supplements an earlier report [1] on a follow-up survey of inactive job applicants which was conducted in the Raleigh, N. C., area in September of 1968. Whereas the initial report dealt with the status of inactive applicants one month after their applications had been deactivated, this summary presents information relating to the status of a portion of the same applicant group six months subsequent to the one-month follow-up survey.

At the time of the one-month follow-up in September, 1968, an effort was made to survey all of the 986 applicants whose applications had become inactive during the month of August; however, only 586 applicants (59.4 percent) returned mail questionnaires or were contacted in person for information. In the six-month follow-up survey, questionnaires were mailed only to the 586 applicants who had responded or had been contacted at the time of the one-month follow-up. Of these 586 applicants, 419 persons (71.5 percent) responded or were contacted in person. Thus, during the second follow-up survey, information was obtained for only about 43 percent of the original 986 deactivated applicants.

Unless otherwise indicated all data in this supplemental report relate to the 586 applicants who were mailed questionnaires in connection with the six-month follow-up survey.

1/ "Whatever Happened to What's His Name," Employment Security Commission of North Carolina, August, 1968.

HIGHLIGHTS

As in the case of the one-month follow-up survey, one major objective of the six-month follow-up study was to determine the labor force status of job applicants six months after the initial follow-up survey. The following table compares the labor force status of 586 applicants at the time of the one-month and six-month study periods.

L. F. Status	At Time of 1 Mo. Follow-Up No.	%	At Time of 6 Mo. Follow-Up No.	%
Total in Labor Force	494	84.3	464	79.2
Employed	387	66.0	398	67.9
Unemployed	107	18.3	66	11.3
Rate of Unemployment	21.7	xxx	14.2	xxx
Not in Labor Force	90	15.4	119	20.3
Not Determined	2	0.3	3	0.5
Grand Total	586	100.0	586	100.0

Table G presents labor force status and response pattern information for the 586 applicants who were mailed questionnaires at the time of the six-month follow-up survey. As shown in Table G, an effort was made to contact in person 42 of the 182 persons who did not respond to the mail survey; however, only 34 persons could be reached. Nevertheless, information concerning the labor force status of these 34 individuals (which represented 18.7 percent of nonrespondents) was used to estimate the probable labor force status of all nonrespondents. (The procedure followed is shown in tabular form in the appendix). Table A shows the resulting estimated labor force status of all 586 individuals who were sent questionnaires during the six-month follow-up survey.

Table A further presents a cross tabulation depicting the change in labor force status of the 586 applicants between the two survey periods (i.e., from September 1968 to March 1969). From this table it may be seen that of the 387 persons who were employed at the time of the September 1968 study, at least 333 (85 percent) were still employed (not necessarily on the same job) at the time of the March 1969 follow-up. Also 15 of the 387 employed in September had become unemployed by March 1969, and 38 had withdrawn from the labor force.

Tables B and C show cross tabulations of weekly earnings of responding applicants as of the 1st and 2nd follow-up survey. Table B depicts this information for those applicants which had received one or more local office services, whereas Table C shows the information for applicants who received no services.

Table E shows a comparison of average weekly earnings for employed respondents as of the time of their last regular job (as shown on the ES-511), at the time of the one-month follow-up in September 1968, and at the time of the six-month follow-up in March 1969. The weekly earnings data are broken down according to applicant groups which did or did not receive one or more services from the local office. It is apparent from this table that the same trend observed at the time of the one-month follow-up continued to exist at the time of the six-month follow-up; that is, the increase in the mean weekly earnings for those applicants who received services ($5.78) was greater than the gain in the mean weekly earnings of those applicants who did not get services ($4.12). Also, as in the case of the one-month follow-up, the mean weekly earnings for those applicants who did not get services ($88.10) was somewhat higher than the mean weekly earnings for the applicant group which had received services. ($80.85).

Table D presents a cross tabulation of unemployed respondents and respondents who were not in the labor force as of the time of the one-month follow-up by their labor force status at the time of the six-month follow-up. The data in this table also are further broken down into the applicant group which received local office services and the group which did not. It may be noted that a slightly higher proportion (23 percent) of the unemployed who had received ES services were employed at the time of the six-month follow-up than were the unemployed who had not received services (17 percent). Furthermore the average weekly earnings of those who had received service ($67.29) was greater than the earnings of those applicants who did not get services ($55.80). Conversely, among the applicants who were not in the labor force at the time of the one-month follow-up, a greater proportion of the applicants who did not get local office services (30 percent) had entered the labor force and found work than had those applicants who had received services (8 percent). Also, the average weekly earnings of the group which did not receive services was slightly higher ($57.20) than the earnings of the group which had received services ($53.80).

At the time of the one-month follow-up survey there appeared to be no significant difference between the applicant group which received local office services and the group which did not receive services in so far as the proportions who earned more pay, less pay, or the same pay on the job held at survey time when compared with the last regular job shown on the ES-511. As of the time of the six-month follow-up; however, the proportions are noted to have changed somewhat. As may be seen in Table F, among the applicants who had received local office services, 64.3 percent reported that their earnings in March 1969 were higher than in September, 1968. Among applicants who did not receive services,

only 58.1 pecent reported that their earnings had increased over the two survey periods. With respect to applicants reporting lower pay between the two survey intervals the proportions were 19.3 percent for applicants who had received services as opposed to almost 28 percent for applicants who had not received services.

Of the 986 applicants which were inactivated during August, 149 (15 percent) were classified HRD. In response to the one-month follow-up survey in September 1968 a total of 586 applicants responded, of which 85 (14.5 percent) were HRD. During the six-month follow-up survey in March of 1969, a total of 419 applicants responded of which 50 (11.9 percent) were HRD applicants.

Table H presents a cross classification of the labor force status and HRD status of respondents to the one-month follow-up survey by their labor force status as of the time of the six-month follow-up survey. The data summarized in this table appear to indicate that, percentagewise at least, the HRD applicants improved their employment situation over the six-month study interval slightly better than did the non-HRD applicants. For example, at the time of the first follow-up survey of the 85 HRD respondents, 27 (almost 32 percent) were unemployed. Six months later of the 50 responding HRD applicants only 13, (or 26 percent) were unemployed. Among non-HRD responding applicants the proportions unemployed at the one-month and six-month follow-up intervals respectively were 16 percent and 12 percent.

TABLE A

Labor Force Status of Respondents To the One-Month Follow-Up Period By Their Estimated* Labor Force Status As Of The Six-Month Follow-Up Period

Labor Force Status Of Respondents At Time of 1-Mo. Follow-Up September 1968		LABOR FORCE STATUS AT TIME OF SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP (MARCH 1969)			
		Employed	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force	L.F. Status Not Determined
Status	No. Of Respondents				
Employed	387	333	15	38	1
Unemployed	107	46	39	22	0
Not In Labor Force	90	19	12	59	0
L.F. Status Not Determined	2	0	0	0	2**
TOTAL	586	398	66	119	3
PERCENT OF TOTAL	100.0	67.9	11.3	20.3	0.5

* The Labor Force Status of 148 non-respondents plus 19 persons whose questionnaires were returned by the Post Office (total 167 individuals) as of the six-month follow-up period was estimated on the basis of the labor force experience of 34 persons who were contacted by telephone.

** Questionnaires were returned by Post Office as undeliverable.

TABLE B

COMPARISON OF APPLICANTS WEEKLY EARNINGS AT TIME OF ONE-MONTH AND SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UPS

Weekly Earnings Of Employed Respondents At Time of 1st Survey September 1968 Weekly Earnings	No.	Labor Force Status at Time of 2nd Survey - March, 1969				Persons who received services - respondents to 1st and 2nd surveys Weekly earnings at time of 2nd survey and number of persons at each interval																
		Unemployed	Not in L.F.	L.F. Stat. Not Det.	Employed	Wage Not Stated	Under $50	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	110-119	120-129	130-139	140-149	150-159	160-169	170-179	180-189	190-199
Wage Not Stated	44	1	3	1	21	3	4		1	2	3	5				1		1				
Under $50	36	3	5		19	1	11		1	3			1		2							
50 - 59	24	1	1		10		3	4	2	1												
60 - 69	52	2	4		37	2	3		14	14	3	1										
70 - 79	44		3		29		1			14	10		1	1	1				1			
80 - 89	35		1		19	3			1	1	9	3	1	1								
90 - 99	14				10			1			1	5	1	1	1							
100 - 109	11				8					1			2	4	1							
110 - 119	4		1		2					1						1						
120 - 129	8		1		5				1							1	2	1				
130 - 139	5		1		3						1						2					
140 - 149	2				2											1	1					
150 - 159	3				1																1	
160 - 169	0																					
170 - 179	1																					
180 - 189	1				1															1		
190 - 199	0																					
Over 200	1	1																				
TOTAL	285	8	20	1	167	9	22	5	20	37	27	14	6	7	5	4	5	2	1	1	1	

TABLE B
COMPARISON OF APPLICANTS WEEKLY EARNINGS AT TIME
OF ONE-MONTH AND SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UPS

PERSONS WHO RECEIVED SERVICES - RESPONDENTS TO 1ST AND 2ND SURVEYS

WEEKLY EARNINGS AT TIME OF 2ND SURVEY AND NUMBER OF PERSONS AT EACH INTERVAL																		
WAGE NOT STATED	UNDER $50	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	110-119	120-129	130-139	140-149	150-159	160-169	170-179	180-189	190-199	OVER 200	NON-RESPOND. TO 2ND SURVEY
3	4		1	2	3	5				1		1					1	18
1	11		1	3			1		2									9
	3	4	2	1														12
2	3		14	14	3	1												9
	1			14	10		1	1	1				1					12
3			1	1	9	3	1	1										15
		1			1	5	1	1	1									4
				1			2	4	1									3
				1						1								1
			1							1	2	1						2
					1						2							1
										1	1							
															1			2
																		1
														1				
9	22	5	20	37	27	14	6	7	5	4	5	2	1	1	1		1	89

TABLE C
COMPARISON OF APPLICANTS WEEKLY EARNINGS AT TIME
OF ONE-MONTH AND SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UPS

Weekly Earnings Of Employed Respondents At Time Of 1st Survey September, 1968 Weekly Earnings	No.	Labor Force Status at Time Of 2nd Survey - March 1969				Persons who did not receive services - respondents to 1st and 2nd surveys																
						Weekly earnings at time of 2nd survey and number of persons at each interval																
		Unemployed	Not In L.F.	L.F. Status Not Det.	Employed	Wage Not Stated	Under $50	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	110-119	120-129	130-139	140-149	150-159	160-169	170-179	180-189	190-199
Wage Not Stated	26	2			9	2			2	1	1				1	1						
Under $50	10		1		5		2	2	1													
50 - 59	6				4				2	1	1											
60 - 69	19	4	1		8			1	5	1		1										
70 - 79	8				8	1			1	3	3											
80 - 89	7				5				1		1	1	1				1					
90 - 99	9	1	1		5	1					1	2	1									
100 - 109	3				2							1				1						
110 - 119	2				2										1					1		
120 - 129	4				2				1						1							
130 - 139	3				1											1						
140 - 149	1																					
150 - 159	0																					
160 - 169	0																					
170 - 179	1																			1		1
180 - 189	2				2																	
190 - 199	0																					
Over 200	1				1																	
TOTAL	102	7	3	0	54	4	2	3	13	6	7	5	2	0	3	3	1		1	1	1	

6

TABLE C

COMPARISON OF APPLICANTS WEEKLY EARNINGS AT TIME OF ONE-MONTH AND SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UPS

PERSONS WHO DID NOT RECEIVE SERVICES - RESPONDENTS TO 1ST AND 2ND SURVEYS

WEEKLY EARNINGS AT TIME OF 2ND SURVEY AND NUMBER OF PERSONS AT EACH INTERVAL																		
Wage Not Stated	Under $50	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	110-119	120-129	130-139	140-149	150-159	160-169	170-179	180-189	190-199	Over 200	Non-Respond. To 2nd Survey
2			2	1	1				1	1							1	15
	2	2	1															4
			2	1	1													2
		1	5	1		1												6
1			1	3	3													0
			1		1	1	1				1							2
1					1	2	1											2
						1				1								1
									1					1				0
			1						1									2
										1								2
																		1
																		1
													1		1			
																	1	
4	2	3	13	6	7	5	2	0	3	3	1		1	1	1		2	38

TABLE D

Labor Force Status of Unemployed Persons and Persons Not in Labor Force At Time of The One-Month Follow-Up by Labor Force Status At Time of Six Month Follow-Up According to Whether or Not Individual Received Services

L. F. Status at Time of One Month Follow-Up September 1968		LABOR FORCE STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AT TIME OF SIX MONTH FOLLOW-UP (MARCH 1969)				
		Employed	Unemployed	Not In L. F.	Total Respondents	Non-Respondents & P.O. Returns
Status	No. of Resp.					
Unemployed:	107	23	31	10	64	43
Received Services	78	18($67.29*)	21	9	48	30
Did Not Receive Services	29	5($55.80*)	10	1	16	13
Not In Labor Force	90	14	7	40	61	29
Received Services	60	5($53.80*)	5	29	39	21
Did Not Receive Services	30	9($57.20*)	2	11	22	8

* Average Weekly Earnings at Time of Six Month Follow-Up.

TABLE E

Comparison of Average Weekly Earnings for Respondents As of Last Job, One-Month Follow-Up, and Six-Month Follow-Up

APPLICANT GROUP		AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS					
		On Last Job (ES-511) For Resp. Who Were Employed At Time of 1 Mo. Follow-Up	At Time of 1 Mo. Follow-Up (September 1968)	Net Gain From Last Job To Time of 1 Mo. Follow-Up	For Persons Employed at Both 1 Mo. & 6 Mo. Follow-Up: At Time of 1 Mo. Follow-Up (September 1968)	At Time of 6 Mo. Follow-Up (March 1969)	Net Gain From 1 Mo. Follow-Up to 6 Mo. Follow-Up
Received ES Services	Mean	$ 65.11	$ 75.51	$ 10.40	$ 75.07	$ 80.85	$ 5.78
	Median	$ 60.00	$ 73.00	$ 13.00	$ 72.00	$ 77.00	$ 5.00
Did Not Receive ES Services	Mean	$ 75.60	$ 83.63	$ 8.03	$ 83.98	$ 88.10	$ 4.12
	Median	$ 64.00	$ 75.00	$ 11.00	$ 76.00	$ 81.00	$ 5.00

NOTE: Weekly earnings data in the last three columns relate only to the 208 respondents who were employed at both follow-up survey periods (1 mo. and 6 Mo.) and who stated a wage in both periods.

It should be noted that of the 107 persons who were unemployed at the time of the 1-month follow-up 23 were working at the time of the 6-month follow-up. Also, of the 90 persons who were not in the labor force at the time of the 1-month follow-up, 14 were working at the time of the 6-month follow-up. (See Table D)

TABLE F

Comparison of Applicants Pay Levels on Last Job, on The One-Month Follow-Up and on The Six-Month Follow-Up According to Whether or Not ES Services Were Received

CATEGORY	ONE-MONTH FOLLOW-UP 1/				SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP 2/			
	Applicants Who Received Services		Applicants Who Did Not Receive Services		Applicants Who Received Services		Applicants Who Did Not Receive Services	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Number Employed Who Furnished Wage Data	194	100.0	62	100.0	140	100.0	43	100.0
Number Reporting Higher Pay	127	65.5	41	66.1	90	64.3	25	58.1
Number Reporting Lower Pay	53	27.3	15	24.2	27	19.3	12	27.9
Number Reporting Same Pay	14	7.2	6	9.7	23	16.4	6	14.0

1/ Comparison is between last job (as shown on ES-511) and job held at time of the one-month follow-up.

2/ Comparison is between job held at time of the one-month follow-up and job held at time of the six-month follow-up.

TABLE G

Labor Force Status of Respondents and Sample of Non-Respondents
Six-Month Follow-Up Survey (March 1969)

Labor Force Status	Respondents (March 1969) 1st Request No.	%	2nd Request No.	%	Sample Of Non-Respondents 1/ No.	%	Non-Respondents	Returned By Post Office	Total No.	%
Employed	175	64.1	83	74.1	22	52.4	-	-	280	47.8
Unemployed	42	15.4	11	9.8	3	7.1	-	-	56	9.5
Not In Labor Force	55	20.1	18	16.1	9	21.4	-	-	82	14.0
Not Determined	1	.4			8	19.0	140	19	168	28.7
TOTAL	273	100.0	112	100.0	42	100.0	140	19	586	100.0
Percent of Total	46.6		19.1		7.2		23.9		100.0	

1/ Efforts were made to contact 42 of the 182 non-respondents (23.1% sample); however 8 of the non-respondents could not be contacted.

TABLE H

Labor Force and HRD Status of Respondents to the One-Month Follow-Up Survey
by Their Labor Force Status as of The Six-Month Follow-Up Period

Labor Force Status of Respondents at Time of 1-Mo. Follow-Up September 1968 L.F. Status			L.F.Status of Mail Resp. & Persons Contacted as of 6-Mo. Follow-Up								Non-Respondents To 6-Mo. Follow-Up Including P.O. Returns 1/	
			Employed		Unemployed		Not in L.F.		L. F. Status Not Det.			
	HRD	Non-HRD	HRD	Non-HRD	HRD	Non-HRD	HRD	Non-HRD	HRD	Non-HRD	HRD	Non-HRD
Employed 387	44	343	23	213	2	13	3	22		1	16	94
Unemployed 107	27	80	3	26	10	23	3	10			11	21
Not in L. F. 90	14	76	1	14	1	7	4	40			8	15
L.F. Status Not Determined 2		2										2
TOTAL 586	85	501	27	253	13	43	10	72		1	35	132

1/ Labor Force status shown is as of time of 1-month follow-up survey.

Aggregate Weekly Earnings for Persons Employed
At Both the One-Month and Six-Month Follow-Up Periods 1/

	Earnings in September 1968	Earnings in March 1969	Percent Change
Received Services (140 Persons)	$10,533	$11,528	+ 9.4
Did Not Receive Services (43 Persons)	$ 3,614	$ 3,860	+ 6.8

1/ Excludes persons who failed to report weekly earnings in either (or both) the one-month follow-up and the six-month follow-up periods.

METHOD OF INFLATING LABOR FORCE STATUS OF NON-RESPONDENTS TO SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

(Note: Figures in Parentheses are Estimates)

L. F. Status at Time of The One-Month Follow-Up September, 1968		Total	L.F. STATUS AT TIME OF SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP SURVEY: Employed	Unemployed	Not In L. F.	Not Det.
Employed 387	Responded by Mail	260	221	15	23	1
	Contacted in Person	17	15	0	2	
	Did not Respond & P. O. Returns	110	(97)	(0)	(13)	
110 ÷ 17 = 6.470	Total	387	333	15	38	1
Unemployed 107	Responded by Mail	64	23	31	10	
	Contacted in Person	11	6	2	3	
	Did Not Respond & P. O. Returns	32	(17)	(6)	(9)	
32 ÷ 11 = 2.909	Total	107	46	39	22	
Not in Labor Force 90	Responded by Mail	61	14	7	40	
	Contacted in Person	6	1	1	4	
	Did Not Respond & P. O. Returns	23	(4)	(4)	(15)	
23 ÷ 6 = 3.833	Total	90	19	12	59	
L. F. Not Det. 2	Returned by P. O.	2				2
TOTAL 586	Responded by Mail	385	258	53	73	1
	Contacted in Person	34	22	3	9	
	Did Not Respond & P. O. Returns	167	(118)	(10)	(37)	2
	TOTAL	586	398	66	119	3

A blow-up factor for each L. F. component was computed by dividing the total non-respondents in the component by the response sample contacts in that component. The resultant factor for the component was then applied to the sample labor force status data for the component. Example for employed: 110 ÷ 17 = 6.470 Factor X 15 sample employed = 97 total estimated employed non-respondents, etc.